	Ι
1	STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF WARREN SUPREME COURT
3	EVELYN O'BRIEN, JAMIE LYNN PATCHETT, CHRIS FORTNER, MICHAEL PETTA, JESSICA TAYLOR-MACKRODT, and HEATHER MARTIN on behalf of themselves and others similarly
4	situated,
5	Plaintiffs,
6 7	-against- Index 65232/2018
, 8 9	SAGBOLT, LLC, OCEAN PROPERTIES, LTD, PORTSMOUTH CORPORATE FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC., PATRICK WALSH, and THOMAS GUAY,
10	Defendants.
11	HELD VIRTUALLY VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
12	January 20, 2023
13	FAIRNESS HEARING
14	
15 16	B E F O R E: HON. MARTIN D. AUFFREDOU JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
17	APPEARANCES:
18	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
19	THE LAW OFFICE OF ANANDA CHAUDHURI BY: ANANDA N. CHAUDHURI, ESQ.
20	FLEISCHMAN, BONNER & ROCCO, LLP
21	BY: KEITH FLEISCHMAN, ESQ. TYLER VAN PUT, ESQ.
22	THE LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH T. MOEN
23	BY: JOSEPH T. MOEN, ESQ.
2425	
۵۵	

	2
1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)
2	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
3	GREENBERG, TRAURIG, LLP BY: CATHERINE H. MOLLOY, ESQ.
4	MICHAEL SLOCUM, ESQ.
5	ALSO PRESENT: Sheila Kent, Court Clerk
6	ALSO PRESENT: SHETTA REHE, COULT CIETA
7	LISA A. STADTLANDER
8	Official Senior Reporter
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	ı

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL (Proceedings held via Microsoft Teams.)

THE COURT: Let's get started. We're on the record. Good, afternoon everyone. It's very nice to see all of you again. It's been awhile. This has been a lengthy proceeding, and the attorneys have worked very hard to reach a well-negotiated settlement, which today is the subject of a -- just

(Whereupon, an off-the-record discussion was held.)

go off the record for a second, Lisa.

THE COURT: -- which today is the subject of a Final Fairness Hearing. There is also returnable today a motion for plaintiffs' -- S apostrophe -- unopposed motion for final approval of class action settlement for an award of attorneys' fees and costs and for incentive awards to the Class representatives, and again, a Final Fairness Hearing scheduled for today at this time by Teams on the class action settlement.

Let start with appearances. Attorney Chaudhuri, let's start with you.

MR. CHAUDHURI: Yes. Ananda Chaudhuri, for plaintiffs in this action, and I'm with the Law Office of Ananda Chaudhuri.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL 1 Attorney Van Put. 2 MR. VAN PUT: This is Tyler Van Put, from 3 Fleischman, Bonner and Rocco, PLLC, also representing 4 the plaintiffs as Class counsel. THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 5 Attorney Moen. 6 7 MR. MOEN: This is Joe Moen, from the Law Office of Joseph T. Moen, representing the 8 9 plaintiffs. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 11 Attorney Molloy. MS. MOLLOY: Good afternoon, your Honor. 12 13 Attorney Catie Molloy, on behalf of the defendants, 14 and also with me -- I'm sure you'll have him 15 introduce himself -- is Mike Slocum, and we're with 16 Greenberg, Traurig. 17 THE COURT: Attorney Slocum? 18 MR. SLOCUM: Michael Slocum, Greenberg, 19 Traurig, appearing with Miss Molloy, for defendants. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. I will note 21 that Attorney Fleischman also represents plaintiffs 22 in this class action. He has attempted to join us, he's been unable to do so so far, but he advised 23 24 Attorney Van Put to begin this afternoon's

proceedings without him. Hopefully he'll be able to

25

Attorney Chaudhuri.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHAUDHURI: Yes, your Honor. This is Attorney Chaudhuri. So first I would just like to address the claims process, which was extraordinarily successful in this case and shows widespread support

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL for the class action. So defendants' counsel provided us with a list of class members, wait staff who worked at the Sagamore during the relevant time period. There were 793 members. Our claims administrator Arden attempted to reach out to them, and where letters were returned, they performed skiptracing and was able to identify many of those whose addresses had since changed. At the end of the day, 764 out of 793 class members were located and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe our papers erroneously at one point said 76%, but it is 96%. So our claims administrator did a great job in finding these class members.

successfully received notice of this class action.

That's a 96% -- that's 96% of the class.

Of those, there were zero objections to the settlement and two potential class members opted out, and so that represents --

THE COURT: If you could go back to where you said two potential class members opted out and start again from there. Thank you.

MR. CHAUDHURI: Two potential class members opted out. That demonstrates almost 96% of the class members received notice and chose to participate in the class action.

So, you know, for the settlement and, you

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL know, the notice which set forth the requested attorneys' fees, administrative fees, the dollar amount of the settlement, there was wide support among class members for that.

Also part of the motion is we're requesting a service fee of \$10,000 for each of the named plaintiffs. And we cited case law in our brief that shows that that is a reasonable amount and has been awarded in prior actions.

And I just want to say these plaintiffs, these named plaintiffs spent a lot of time participating in this case. Plaintiff O'Brien was deposed three time, Plaintiff Faulkner was deposed two times. The other plaintiffs were deposed one time each. They provided documents and were very responsive to the attorneys' questions and really helped us put together this case.

It's also important to recognize that it is not an easy thing for a potential plaintiff to set forth and put their name on the Complaint, especially, you know, in a small community where you're dealing with a large employer like Sagamore. So they did -- they were very involved in doing that, and so for those reasons the \$10,000 attorneys' fee is I think warranted in this case.

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL

We're seeking \$12,000 in administrative fees, and that is customary. Again, we cited case law where -- or other cases where administrators received some more fees, and in our experience as attorneys, Arden did a great job in identifying class members, and we believe those fees are reasonable.

We are also seeking \$399,999 in attorneys' fees. We liken it to a percentage method of calculating attorneys' fees, and here with the 1.2 million settlement, that is one-third of the settlement and that is customary.

New York courts also use the lodestar method to crosscheck whether the percentage method is reasonable, and in this case the three firms combined have billed 1,636.9 hours, and with the fees set forth in customary bills by the attorneys, with the fees set forth in Mr. Fleischman's affirmation that is a negative lodestar of .5. You know, you'll see courts sometimes will award two times the lodestar, three times lodestar, you know, and we have a negative lodestar here.

Also in the papers we did calculate a blended average hourly rate of \$244.30, and you know, that is, you know, it's a blended average of \$244.30, and that is below what other courts have approved in

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL similar class actions as a reasonable hourly rate for even less experienced attorneys here. So for those reasons we request that our motion be approved in its entirety and the settlement represents a fair,

hard-fought negotiation that has benefited the class.

THE COURT: Counsel Chaudhuri, I should have asked you before you began whether or not you anticipated any of the named plaintiffs to appear in person. We did offer to conduct a hybrid proceeding today in the courtroom and by Teams, and I failed to ask you that. I had a note to do that and I just overlooked it. I haven't heard that any of the named party plaintiffs are in the courthouse, but if you were anticipating them to be here, we should make arrangements for them to be included.

MR. CHAUDHURI: We do not anticipate them to be here. So they have -- they're aware of the hearing today and they have requested that counsel handle it.

> Thanks, counsel. THE COURT:

Same question for Attorneys Molloy and Slocum, did you anticipate any of the defendants! representatives being present in person today to participate in a hybrid fashion?

MS. MOLLOY: Your Honor, this is Miss Molloy.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL We do not anticipate any appearance from the individual or corporate defendants.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Attorney Chaudhuri, I will return to you as appropriate, are there any other plaintiffs' attorneys who would would like to be heard with respect to the hearing, with respect to the motion for final order at this time? And that includes you, Attorney Fleischman.

MR. FLEISCHMAN: Thank you, your Honor. This is Keith Fleischman. If you can all hear me, I have a couple of brief comments. Mr. Chaudhuri has touched on them, but I think it's important to echo those comments and illuminate them a little bit.

In connection with the settlement itself and the fairness of it, and obviously this Court has to judge as to whether the settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, as the Court is the well aware because this court was adjudicating, there were numerous, numerous disputes in this case. It was a very, very hard-fought litigation. The lawyers on behalf of the Class and, you know, as Mr. Chaudhuri mentioned, one plaintiff was deposed three times, no stone was left unturned in connection with the investigation of this Class, and quite frankly,

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL defendants were very, very worthy advocates and it was a very-hard fought litigation. I think that there came a time, they're doing many litigations, that both sides realized there was tremendous risk, and that the appropriate thing was to really try to hammer out a settlement, if one could be done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I'll note for the Court, the Court may well be aware of it, that there were times, in fact, when negotiations started, they started on several instances and went nowhere. And even the negotiation at the end of the case between Miss Molloy and myself was -- it was a negotiation in good faith, it was arm's length, but it was very, very hard fought as well.

So the result of this case, and as Ananda mentioned, when you have a negative multiplier, you have no objections at all, you have just two opt-outs, you have 96% of the class that is participating in the settlement, being probably one of the more senior people on this call and having spent years and years in class actions prior to other things, this is -- it's an unusual settlement in a lot of ways. Not just the lodestar check, but also the fact that you have no objections and you have this tremendous participation and the result itself,

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL that there will be meaningful recovery for the Class

2 members who participate.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think that -- I just wanted to put that on the record as part of the record that there is -and it's in our papers as well -- there are numerous reasons why this settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate and should be approved by the Court. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Any other plaintiffs' attorneys wish to be heard at this time?

MR. VAN PUT: Yes, your Honor. This is Attorney Van Put. I just want to reiterate some points that Attorney Chaudhuri made about the Class reception to this settlement. And as Mr. Chaudhuri pointed out, there have only been two opt-outs out of the 764 class members who received notification and there have been no objections either to the settlement or to the fees that we're requesting today, the service fees, the attorneys' fees or the claims administration fees.

In addition to that, I just want to alert the Court that I have fielded some calls from people that received notice that they're members of the Class, as well as Attorney Moen, and in each of those instances

know, the Class members who spoke to me indicated

money potentially coming in at what is essentially

the tail end hopefully of a global pandemic that

really affected the availability and the work that

people in the hospitality industry had over the last

few years was significant, and any recovery they can

get, you know, any amount of money in the settlement

would really go a long way, particularly, you know,

today at the end of all of this.

So in addition to the lack of opt-out or minimum opt-out and lack of objections, we received positive feedback from people that have contacted our offices as well. Thank you.

MR. MOEN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Attorney Moen.

MR. MOEN: So, yeah, just to reiterate what Tyler said, really positive responses from the Class members who have called to express interest in the settlement, so I think they were very excited to potentially receive some funds.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Attorney Chaudhuri, before I turn to defendants' counsel, any further thoughts, comments, input?

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL

MR. CHAUDHURI: No, your Honor. Nothing

further than what my co-counsel has added. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Turning to defendants' counsel. Attorney
Molloy, Attorney Slocum, your thoughts on this
settlement, your thoughts on the fees, on the service
awards, et cetera. I have in the papers that there
is no opposition, but that doesn't mean that I don't
want to hear your comments and any concerns that you
have about this settlement and the final numbers or
distribution numbers.

MS. MOLLOY: Thank you, your Honor. This is
Attorney Molloy. As the plaintiffs' counsel has
indicated, these were hard-fought disputed claims.
The plaintiffs sat for multiple depositions. Each of
the defendants still denies any liability and
believes it would ultimately be successful in this
matter, however, we all agree that this is a fair and
reasonable settlement that the parties have agreed to
and we have no objection to the service payments or
the amount of attorney's fees.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.

Attorney Slocum.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor. No, nothing to add beyond what Ms. Molloy stated. I agree

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL

this was a very well-contested dispute on both sides,
and the negotiations were definitely arm's length. I
believe this is a good settlement.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

As to the proposed order, Attorney Molloy,
Attorney Slocum, I assume you've had an opportunity
to review, comment, input, modify, et cetera, the
order that's before me that came to me on January 5.
Is defense counsel in agreement with the terms of
that order, and should this settlement be approved;
are you okay with me signing the order as presented?

MS. MOLLOY: Yes, your Honor. That was an agreed proposed order, and plaintiffs' counsel ran that by us before submitting and allowed us to make comment and revisions.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

MS. MOLLOY: This is Attorney Molloy. I apologize, we didn't hear any of that.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's because I muted -- sorry. Off the record.

(Whereupon, an off-the-record discussion was held.)

THE COURT: As to the service award, \$10,000 each to the named plaintiff, which comes out of the gross amount, Defense -- the defendants are okay with

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL 16 that as a distribution to those named plaintiffs, am I understanding that correctly?

MS. MOLLOY: Your Honor, we defer to the plaintiffs and to the claims administrator generally on how the funds and distributions are calculated and disbursed. You know, the plaintiffs have chosen to allocate \$10,000 to each of the named plaintiffs. The service award, we maintain no position on that. We do not object and we leave that to the plaintiffs to determine.

THE COURT: And you don't question the legality of that?

MS. MOLLOY: Not the legality, no, your Honor.

THE COURT: And as to the amount, you're leaving that to the discretion of plaintiffs' counsel and the plaintiffs themselves?

MS. MOLLOY: That's correct.

THE COURT: Attorney Chaudhuri, anything else for plaintiffs?

MR. CHAUDHURI: Nothing from plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Any other plaintiffs' counsel, anything to add at this time or to clarify any final concerns? Anything else that you wanted to bring up before but may have overlooked?

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL

MR. FLEISCHMAN: Nothing from plaintiffs,

2 your Honor.

MR. VAN PUT: Nothing further, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Well, thank you very much.

I'll note that the parties were fully represented in today's proceedings, the Fairness Hearing and the Motion For Final Approval as well, and I've had an opportunity to review all of the papers that have been submitted and in very, very more-than-sufficient detailed terms and analysis setting forth the history of this proceeding, how the settlement was arrived at, why the settlement was arrived at and a very detailed affirmation from not only counsel, but memos of law, two memos of law, and also a detailed affirmation from Barry J. Peek of Arden, who was the claims administrator here, explaining the process that his firm engaged in to provide notice to the Class.

You know, in looking at this you can't help but be impressed with a 96% deliverable rate. It is as near perfect as you could possibly ask for. Zero objections were received, two potential class members opting out, which has been detailed in the papers and examined here today. I know from my experience with

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL this file, from my experience with these attorneys who have all shown nothing but exceptional skill and talent throughout the course of this proceeding, I know how hard-fought this was and how diligently this settlement was negotiated. I know based upon the reputation and expertise of these attorneys that they would not have arrived at a settlement if all of them did not believe that it was fair and reasonable and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

adequate.

I conclude that it is -- I find no reason not to approve this settlement. It is essentially on consent and which includes all of the -- the gross amount of a million two, it includes the attorneys! fees and costs, which total 420,854.48, the claims administrator of \$12,000, the service award fee of of 60,000, 10,000 for each named plaintiff, which is comprised of that for a net settlement fund resulting in 707,145.52. And I'm getting all of that from the affirmation of Mr. Peek, which is in the record and was included with a motion papers for final approval that were submitted on January 5.

I have had an opportunity to review the I'm going to grant plaintiffs' proposed order. motion for final approval of the class action settlement. I'm going to sign the order.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so.

anticipate making any changes or additions to that. I've looked at it a number of times in anticipation of today's proceedings. We'll upload the proposed order, and do I understand, Attorney Fleischman, do I understand -- just go back for one second, I'm going back to your motion papers when the preliminary approval was given for the class action settlement, and in those motions papers you indicated you would be making the motion for final approval. You've done

Counselors, are there any other motions or applications that must be made to the Court, or does this bring this proceeding to its conclusion?

MR. FLEISCHMAN: Your Honor, Keith Fleischman. Respectfully, there are no other motions that I'm aware of. These motion papers and ultimately the orders that you've indicated you're going to sign ends this litigation.

THE COURT: All are in agreement with that?

MR. CHAUDHURI: Yes, your Honor.

MR. SLOCUM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counselors who practice class action litigation on a regular basis, are there any particular findings that you would like me to address on the record that I have not already

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL addressed, or is there anything -- well, or is there anything in addition that you would like me to recite

for this record before signing the order?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FLEISCHMAN: Your Honor, this is Keith Fleischman. I think you've indicated quite clearly that the settlement itself is fair, reasonable and adequate, and you've given your reasons why, which are well-regarded. And then I think you probably want to just on the record make a notation that the fees, in light of the fact that there is a negative multiplier and in light of the 96% take rate of the participants, the Class members, and in light of the fact that over a thousand hours were spent in that, actually plaintiffs' counsel is getting 50% less of what they actually expended in attorney hours, that you find the fee application and the fees and expenses to plaintiffs, as well as the service award to the lead plaintiffs to be reasonable as well.

THE COURT: Thank, you, counsel. I do so find that the rational for the fees is set forth in considerable detail in the motion papers. The fees that are being paid here to counsel, including the administrator fees, including the service awards, based upon the work that's been done, based upon the expertise, based upon their hourly rates, based upon

ĺ	O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL 21
1	the enormous amount of time that all counsel have
2	invested here, I know of nothing else to say other
3	than these fees and proposed are eminently reasonable
4	and fair and are so approved.
5	MR. FLEISCHMAN: Thank you, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	Anyone else have anything else that they
8	would like to say at this juncture?
9	MR. FLEISCHMAN: Nothing from plaintiffs,
10	your Honor. It's been a pleasure litigating before
11	your court, and thank you very much.
12	MR. SLOCUM: On behalf of the defendants,
13	your Honor, we'll echo that sentiment, and we
14	appreciate all that you've done.
15	THE COURT: Well, thank you for those
16	comments, and my thanks to each and every one of you.
17	I know that it's maybe not said as often as it should
18	be I'm getting an echo, and I'm not sure why.
19	Attorney Fleischman, could you mute?
20	MR. FLEISCHMAN: I just did, your Honor. I
21	will right now.
22	THE COURT: All right. I think the echo is
23	resolved.

It's not said as often as it should, but I

want all of you to be mindful of the fact that me

24

25

O'BRIEN, ET AL V. SAGBOLT, ET AL 22 sitting here as the judge overseeing this proceeding and watching all of you perform your work and your craft and doing so in such a magnificently, professional manner month after month, year after year, working so hard to get this outcome for your clients, I want you to know that your excellence in the work has not gone unnoticed here. I marveled at it each and every time we've met. Each and every time I've read anything that any of you have produced I've marveled at it. You have served your clients very well here, and all of you have much to be proud of. It's indeed my great honor to be able to work

for your service.

I wish all of you well. I'm glad we were able to bring this to closure. You did it, not me. All of you did it. I'm glad we're able to bring this to closure, and I hope, I sincerely hope I have the opportunity to work again with each and every one of you. And I wish all of you the very best.

with attorneys of such high caliber, so I thank you

MR. FLEISCHMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. SLOCUM: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. MOLLOY: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. We will close today's proceeding. All have a good day and good weekend.

Take care. (Whereupon, the matter was concluded at 2:15 P.M.) REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I, LISA STADTLANDER, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that I recorded stenographically the foregoing proceedings, taken at the time and place as mentioned, and the preceding is a true and accurate transcript thereof, to the best of my knowledge and belief. LISA STADTLANDER SENIOR COURT REPORTER